DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 679 JC 760 354

AUTHOR Hecht, Alfred R.; Henry, Bonnie
TITLE Development of a Semantic Differential Instrument for Student Evaluation of Community College Counseling Conferences.
PUB DATE Jul 76
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the North Central Region AERA Special Interest Group on Community/Junior College Research (Madison, Wisconsin, July 15-16, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Counseling Effectiveness; *Counselor Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; Junior Colleges; *Rating Scales; *Semantic Differential; Validity
IDENTIFIERS Moraine Valley Community College

ABSTRACT

In the past, annual student evaluation of counselor effectiveness at Moraine Valley Community College (Illinois) has been conducted by means of three unvalidated instruments. In order to achieve increased accountability, a student services committee has developed a conceptual design for a comprehensive counselor effectiveness evaluation system. As a component of the larger system, a valid and reliable diagnostic instrument was developed for student evaluation of individual counseling services. This instrument was designed with a semantic differential scale to measure the effectiveness of three different counseling processes (acceptance of client, counselor self-acceptance, counselor support), and two counseling outcomes (conference worthwhileness, client independence). A jury of counselors, counselor educators, and counselor administrators confirmed the content and construct validity of the instrument. Construct validity was also demonstrated by means of a principal components analysis of 281 student evaluations of 11 counselors. Internal consistency reliability coefficients confirmed the multidimensionality of the instrument. A survey of the literature on counselor evaluation is presented, as are complete statistical results of the jury evaluation and preliminary application of the instrument. The instrument itself is appended. (Author/NRM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FRO
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINION
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE O
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED125679

DEVELOPMENT OF A SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE COUNSELING CONFERENCES

by

Alfred R. Hecht, Director of Research and Evaluation

Moraine Valley Community College, Palos Hills, Illinois

and

Bonnie Henry, Director of Counseling Services

Prairie State Community College

Chicago Heights, Illinois

A Paper
Presented to the
1976 Annual Meeting
of the
North Central Region
AERA/SIG Community/Junior College Research

Madison, Wisconsin
July 15-16, 1976

JC 760 354

DEVELOPMENT OF A SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE COUNSELING CONFERENCES

by

Alfred R. Hecht
Director of Research and Evaluation
Moraine Valley Community College
Palos Hills, Illinois

and

Bonnie Henry
Director of Counseling Services
Prairie State Community College
Chicago Heights, Illinois

Abstract

A semantic differential instrument was developed for student evaluation of individual counseling conferences.

A jury of counselors, counselor educators and counselor administrators confirmed the content and construct validity of the instrument.

Construct validity was demonstrated, also, by means of a principal components analysis of 281 students evaluations of 11 counselors. This analysis yielded three process and two outcomes factors which accounted for 60 percent of the total common variance.

Internal consistency reliability coefficients, which were high for both instrument and factor scores, confirmed the multi-dimensionality of the instrument, also.

This instrument is used currently in our counselor evaluation system.

Development of a Semantic Differential Instrument for
Student Evaluation of Community College Counseling Conferences

The importance of the counselor's ability to examine, criticize and improve his counseling performance has been expressed by many counselor educators (e.g., Boy and Pine, 1966; Patterson, 1964; Peters and Hanson, 1963; and Truax, 1965). Martin and Gazda (1970) indicate that the need for a method of counselor self-evaluation extends beyond the training program.

Unfortunately, however, little research on the measurement of counselor effectiveness has been reported (Blocker, 1966; Brown, 1969; and Thorsen, 1969). For example, Brown reviewed seven years of the Personnel and Guidance Journal. He noted that although 161 articles (or 19%) were concerned with the counseling process, only 36 articles (or 4.4%) dealt with outcomes. Brown concluded that relatively little research has dealt with counseling outcomes. In a recent review of literature, King (1975) stated "As a body, psychologists, especially professional service providers...are not conscientious about checking on the effectiveness of their work (p. 3)."

Furthermore, because it focuses on therapy or counselor training, the majority of literature in this area has little relevance for evaluating the effectiveness of community college counselors. The instruments developed by Truax and Carkhuff (1966) and by Whiteley, Sprinthall, Mosher, and Donaghy (1967) for example, are oriented toward psychotherapy. Other instruments and procedures such as those presented by Eckstein (1974) and by Silverman and Quinn (1972) are designed for counselor training. Whereas these instruments and approaches provide suggestions for measuring the effectiveness of community college counselors, none can be adopted entirely.

Although the counselor evaluation instruments developed at a number of community colleges were reviewed (Delta College, MI, William Rainey Harper College, IL, Meramec Community College, MO, and Sacramento City College, CA: Kinnebrew and Day, 1973), none of these colleges reported data on the validity or reliability of their instruments. In addition, the role of the counselor, as defined by these instruments, varied from college to college. Again, while suggesting several items for instrument development, the lack of data on their technical characteristics made these instruments inappropriate for our use.

Reflecting this larger context, annual student evaluation of counselor effectiveness at Moraine Valley Community College has been conducted by means of three unvalidated instruments. As we move toward increased accountability throughout our college, however, a student services committee has developed a conceptual design for a comprehensive system for evaluating counselor effectiveness. As a component of the larger system, the purpose of this project was to develop a valid and reliable diagnostic instrument for student evaluation of individual counseling conferences.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In addition to the evaluation instruments of the community colleges named previously, the literature reviewed for this project included books dealing with counseling theory, a DATRIX II search of doctoral dissertations directed toward the measurement of counselor effectiveness and review of ERIC documents and journal articles concerned with evaluation of counselor effectiveness or the development of evaluation instruments.

The literature search focused on effective counseling processes, anticipated counseling outcomes and measuring counselor effectiveness. The literature review is presented according to these topics.

Effective Counseling Processes

Although extensive, the literature regarding effective counseling processes is contradictory. Rowe, Murphy, and De Csipkes (1975) reviewed research reported since 1960 on the relationship between counselor characteristics and counseling effectiveness. Although a sizable effort has been invested in this area, they viewed the results as generally disappointing, often contradictory, and only tentative.

On the one hand, Rogers (1961a), Snyder and Snyder (1961), Truax (1963), Truax and Carkhuff (1964a), and others place emphasis on the counseling relationship and the need to establish this relationship with the client before effective counseling can take place. Perez (1965) asserted that the counselor can initiate, facilitate, and maintain the interactive process if he communicates feelings of spontaneity and warmth, tolerance, respect, and sincerity. In order to continue the interactive process between the counselor and the client, Patterson (1966) felt that a minimum of emphatic understanding is necessary: empathy, interest, acceptance, and understanding are characteristics which are essential for influencing others therapeutically.

In contrast, Rowe, et al. (1975) suggested that the focus of research should shift from the personality of the counselor to particular behaviors, skills, or interactions and their relationship to counseling outcomes. Emphasis should change from what the counselor is, which is often arbitrarily defined, to what he can perform. The authors reported that initial efforts at associating particular counselor behaviors with counseling outcomes have produced optimistic results. For instance, Banks, Berenson, and Carkhuff (1966) have found that clients of high-facilitative counselors engage in significantly more self-exploration than clients of low-facilitative counselors. Furthermore, numerous investigations (summarized by Carkhuff, 1972) successfully demonstrate the significant influence of high counselor facilitation on several indexes of counseling outcomes. Carkhuff views the high-facilitator as a person who possesses a large repertoire of skills rather than one who represents certain abstract personality traits.

Several studies have been conducted dealing with measured characteristics of counselors. A number of studies reported that the counselor is person-oriented as opposed to things-oriented. This quality is variously referred to as warmth, friendliness, altruism, social service, and interpersonal sensitivity by Stefflre, King, and Leafgren (1962), Combs and Soper (1963), and Wicas and

Mahan (1966). Receptivity, another trait relevant to counselors, is reported as passivity, conformity, flexibility, or absence of dogmatism (Stefflre, King, and Leafgren, 1962; Combs and Soper, 1963; Wicas and Mahan, 1966; and Milliken and Paterson, 1967). A third trait counselors share is that of basic ego strength or self-acceptance, which is identified as emotional stability, self-confidence, self-control, intelligence, or a greater involvement with reality and problem solving than with one's own inner needs (Stefflre, King and Leafgren, 1962; Combs and Soper, 1963; and Wicas and Mahan, 1966).

Despite the apparent diversity of theories and empirical findings, several common themes identifying the characteristics of effective counselors emerge. These include:

(1) the ability to communicate personal self-acceptance;
(2) acceptance of the client;
(3) receptivity or responsiveness to the client; and
(4) support of the client.

Because these processes are applicable to the educational, vocational and personal-social domains of the client's life, they were used as factors on the Moraine Valley student evaluation of counselor instrument to measure counseling process. Terms suggested from the literature review such as "interested," "accepting," "receptive," "sensitive," and "comfortable" were used as items in measuring these scales.

Anticipated Counseling Outcomes

In recent years, student or human development has been employed as a model or philosophy by community college counselors. Brown (1972) defined student development in terms of what college catalogs and goal statements often describe as the "whole student" or the "liberally educated" person. He noted that most college goal statements aspire to promote independence of thought and critical thinking in students; to make students better citizens as well as to make them more knowledgeable about their cultural heritage; to help students understand themselves and relate better with others; and, of course, to prepare them for a profession.

Rogers (1961b) indicated that counseling should help the client "become more self-directing, less rigid, more open to the evidence of his senses, better organized and integrated, more similar to the idea which he has chosen for himself."

Patterson (1966) defined the goal of counseling as "the changing of behavior or personality in some respect or to some extent." He also asserted that the goal is for the client to become a responsible, independent, self-actualizing person capable of determining his own behavior."

According to Smith (1974):

> A client is most likely to seek help because of either a problem with the self (internal conflict) or an environmental concern (inability to cope effectively with some aspect of external reality). The task of the counselor--in addition to communicating warmth, respect and empathy to the client--is to help the client discover the specific problem and clearly state his or her goal for the counseling process.

The outcomes of counseling include a wide range of behavior change. The client should become more independent, or autonomous; he should develop critical thinking abilities, gaining a greater sense of identity as well as relating more effectively with others. The client should become freer but also more responsible; he should become more self-actualizing.

From these rather specific outcomes of counseling, less specific, more general outcomes were selected for use as factors on the student evaluation of counselors instrument. These areas include:

(1) conference worthwhileness;
(2) client independence; and
(3) client self-acceptance.

The literature review provided definitions for these scales. Conference worthwhileness is defined as a situation in which the counselee believes that he or she has been helped to overcome obstacles to personal growth (APA, 1956). Client independence is achieved when the client believes he or she has become more independent, self-directing, and autonomous (Patterson, 1966; Rogers, 1961b; and Chickering, 1969). Client self-acceptance is attained as the client becomes more self-actualizing in terms of determining his own behavior (Patterson, 1966).

Measuring Counselor Effectiveness

A rating scale approach to the evaluation of counseling effectiveness emerged in the 1960's. In one form of this approach, trained observers use carefully constructed scales to rate counselor performance on the basis of characteristics considered essential for productive counseling. Two such scales are the Counselor Rating Scale (CRS) (Whiteley, Sprinthall, Mosher and Donaghy, 1967) and the Truax and Carkhuff Scales (1966). The CRS measures the counselor's behavior and his responses on projective tests. The Truax and Carkhuff Scales measure different levels of counselor functioning along several "core facilitating dimensions" such as empathy, respect, genuineness, and concreteness. The psychotherapy orientation and trained observer requirement of these rating scales made them inappropriate for this project.

In another form of the rating scale approach, clients evaluate counselor effectiveness by recording their perceptions of how often a number of counselor behaviors occur. Two examples of such scales are the Interview Rating Scale (IRS) (Anderson and Anderson, 1962) and the Counseling Evaluation Inventory (CEI) (Linden, Stone and Shertzer, 1965). The IRS consists of 50 Likert-type items designed to provide an operational definition of the counseling relationship characterized by "ideal rapport" between client and counselor. The CEI consists of 21 Likert-type scales which yield three factor scores: counseling climate, counselor comfort, and client satisfaction. Although the validity and reliability of the CEI has been established, and it has been used in several studies of the effectiveness of college counselors, the CEI factors were considered neither sufficiently sound theoretically nor sufficiently diagnostic for use at Moraine Valley.

Competency-based measurement of counselor effectiveness was introduced by Percival in 1974. In his doctoral dissertation Percival had a jury panel of counselor educators, consultants and public school counselors validate a list of 192 counselor competencies categorized into the areas of counseling, consultation, coordination and organization and evaluation. In addition to being geared to the training of public school counselors, Percival's instrument was not tested in practice.

PROCEDURES

On the basis of this review of literature and of the context of the problem, the Student Evaluation of Counselors (SEC) was constructed, subjects were selected, administration and scoring procedures were developed, and procedures for establishing instrument validity and reliability were designed.

Construction of the Student Evaluation of Counselors (SEC)

Although numerous formats were considered for developing instruments, the semantic differential was selected because it is judged sufficiently reliable and valid for many research purposes (Osgood, Ware, and Morris, 1961). According to Kerlinger (1965), it is also flexible and relatively easy to adapt to varying demands, quick and easy to administer and score. The semantic differential uses a simple format to measure the complex psychological meaning of various concepts.

Osgood (1962) suggests that three primary factors exist in the domain of affective meaning. The first and most important factor is called an evaluation dimension, the second is called potency, and the third, activity. Bashook and Foster (1973) suggest that "although many semantic differential instruments measure all three factors, the investigator should himself define this construct before he begins the careful process of developing appropriate concepts and scales." This implies that an instrument may be designed in which only the evaluative factor is measured. In fact, several evaluative factors may be measured on one instrument.

The Moraine Valley instruments used the evaluative factor as defined by Osgood to determine how effectively the counselor utilized those processes or personality characteristics of effective counseling and, furthermore, to evaluate the outcomes or worthwhileness of the counseling process. The student development committee focused on these two dimensions because the former measures how a counselor does what he or she does, and the latter measures the effects of what the counselor does, thus offering a more complete view of the counselor in the counseling process. Each dimension was further conceptualized in terms of several hypothesized factors.

The construction of the SEC involved several steps: concept selection, scale selection, quantifier selection, format development, preparation of instructions, counseling services, and summary comments.

Concept selection. Chosen on the basis of Osgood's (1957) criteria for concept selection, the following concepts represented the counseling process and outcomes dimensions:

(1) During the counseling session, my counselor was:
(2) During the counseling session, my counselor:
(3) My sessions with the counselor were:
(4) As a result of my counseling session:

Scale selection. To measure each hypothesized factor, paired words or phrases were selected or developed from existing instruments and scales according to Osgood's (1957) criteria for scale selection.

Quantifier selection. On the basis of a number of studies using scales with various intervals, Osgood (1957) recommended using seven alternatives, "since with seven alternatives all of them tend to be used and with roughly, if not exactly, equal frequencies." A seven-point scale permits greater variation in responses and, therefore, would be a more sensitive measure of change than three- or five-point scales (Kerlinger, 1965).

Typical directions for completing a semantic differential format designate the central scale position "neutral" and the extreme positions "very." In his instructions, Osgood calls the positions adjacent to the neutral central position "only slightly related" and the positions between these and the extremes "quite closely related" (1957).

SEC quantifiers listed below thus parallel Osgood's seven alternative positions:

VERY	QUITE	SLIGHTLY	DOESN'T APPLY	SLIGHTLY	QUITE	VERY

Since not all clients would perceive all items as being applicable to their particular counseling situation, "doesn't apply" was substituted for "neutral."

Format development. Adapting Osgood's (1957) recommendation to place each concept at the top of a separate page, the dimensions of counseling process and counseling outcomes were therefore assigned separate pages. The order of factor representation within a dimension and the polarity of scales were randomly assigned. Coin-tossing (Hecht, 1970) was used to vary the order of both factor representation and polarity of items whenever possible. As a result of the wording of scales representing the factors of counselor support and worthwhileness, they were not randomly assigned on the instrument. The polarity of items to measure these concepts were randomly assigned, however.

For each of the thirty items, one adjective was placed at each end of an imaginary horizontal line across the page. The seven quantifiers were underscored at the top of each set of adjectives, and a series of zeros and dots were used to represent the quantifiers on each horizontal line.

Preparation of instructions. Separate directions were developed for the counseling process and counseling outcomes portions of the instrument. For the former, respondents were instructed to place an "X" at the point which represented their judgment of the counseling methods used by the counselor; an example was given. The directions for the counseling outcomes portion of the instrument asked the respondents to place an "X" at the point which represented their feelings about the results of their counseling sessions; no example was given.

Counseling services. Since counseling was viewed as encompassing the educational, vocational, and personal-social domains of the client's life, the specific services provided by counselors were evaluated also. Items to measure services, such as giving accurate transfer information, were included on the final page of the instrument. Using the Likert scale below, respondents were asked to respond to the stem "This counselor provided service by: "

STRONGLY AGREE	MODER-ATELY AGREE	SLIGHTLY AGREE	DOESN'T APPLY	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	MODER-ATELY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE

Summary comments. Consistent with the views of Warwick and Lininger (1975) two open-ended questions were constructed for the final portion of the SEC. They were designed so that "the respondent can follow his own logic and chains of association, free from the constraints of an imposed scheme." In tune with the purpose of the instrument, the questions asked respondents to answer regarding areas of strength and potential improvement for the counselor. A sample SEC instrument is presented in Figure 1.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Figure 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Subjects, Administration and Scoring of SEC

Subject selection and administration of SEC. Records of contacts with all students seen for individual counseling appointments from January 1974 to December 1974 were maintained by ten counselors through the use of IBM cards. The student evaluation of counselors instrument was mailed during the spring of 1975 to these students, approximately 600 in number. Instruments were returned by 210 students who had been seen once or twice and 71 students who had been seen three or more times by counselors at Moraine Valley. This initial mailing was designed to provide information on the validity and reliability of the instrument.

Scoring. Following the common practice initiated by Osgood and his associates (1957), response positions for each item were assigned integer values ranging from one for the less favorable pole to seven for the more favorable pole.

The student response choices were coded for keypunching by a Moraine Valley clerk-typist who used transparent scoring masks to determine the numerical value of student responses for each item (Hecht, 1970). Each numerical value was subsequently recorded in an appropriate box on a data coding sheet.

For each student, Moraine Valley keypunch operators punched and verified an IBM card containing counselor designation and other variables (Hecht, 1970).

Because factor scores are less numerous and have been shown to be more reliable than individual item scores (Norman, 1959), they were computed to represent each student's "scores" on the SEC. Kane (1969) studied the validity of the assumed factor structure of fourteen adjective scales used to judge a number of concepts. He concluded that "erroneous results and conclusions would be generated by scoring and analyzing responses based on assumed scale performance." In addition, researchers and practitioners have been advised to specify logically (Heise, 1969) and investigate empirically (McKie and Foster, 1972) the structure of the concept domain under consideration. Therefore, SEC factor scores were computed on the basis of factor analyses of SEC data rather than on the basis of the hypothesized concepts.

Total score, dimension scores, and factor scores were calculated for each student by summing the weighted responses for appropriate items (Osgood, et al., 1957). The response on each item was termed the scale score. A summary sheet containing the average total, dimension, and factor scores was prepared for each counselor. It also contained information regarding the number of respondents and the percentage of agreement with each of the quantifiers related to counseling services.

For each counselor and for a composite of all counselors, average scores of each kind were calculated. An SEC scale score profile sheet was constructed to permit comparison of the individual counselor's average item score profile with the composite average item score profile for all counselors.

Validation and Reliability Procedures for SEC

Statistical and logical procedures were used to validate the SEC. Following the recommendation of Bashook and Foster (1973), responses from all 281 students were pooled for a principal components analysis to evaluate the construct validity of SEC. Content and construct validity were also evaluated by a jury panel consisting of four counselor educators, four community college counselor administrators and four community college counselors. The counselors to be evaluated by the SEC comprised an additional "ad hoc" jury panel. A sample of the questionnaire completed by the jury panel is presented in Figure 2.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Figure 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Internal consistency reliability coefficients were calculated for factor scores and the total score by means of Cronbach's Alpha. Point biserial correlations were calculated to evaluate the relationship between item and factor scores and item and total scores.

All statistical calculations were performed on an IBM 370 computer using programs FACTOR and TESTAT (Veldman, 1967, pp 174-180 and 222-236).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity of the SEC

Factor analysis. Principal components analysis of pooled responses, with varimax rotation to simple structure, yielded three process and two outcomes factors which accounted for 60 percent of the total common variance. As shown in Table 1, the factor loadings suggested these factor descriptions: Conference Worthwhileness, Client Independence, Acceptance of Client, Counselor Self-Acceptance and Counselor Support.

These empirical results agreed closely with the intended results of the SEC. As shown in Table 2, seven factors were initially hypothesized by the student service committee, and five were identified through the factor analysis. Significantly, two factors, "Counselor Support" (factor 5) and "Conference Worthwhileness" (factor 1), were identical to those hypothesized by the student development committee. Among the other five hypothesized factors, one, "Responsiveness to Client" (factor 6), split to become part of two process factors "Acceptance of Client" (factor 3) and "Counselor Self-Acceptance" (factor 4); and two, "Client Self-Acceptance" (factor 8), and "Decision-Making Ability" (factor 7), became one outcomes factor "Independence" (factor 2).

In addition, because no scales crossed over between the process and outcomes dimensions in this analysis, it was inferred that students perceived process and outcomes as separate and distinct dimensions. This analysis also identified three scales which students apparently perceived in different ways.

A second principal components analysis was calculated separately for the process and outcome scales to establish the validity of the factors within each dimension. Although this analysis yielded the same five factors shown in Table 1, it confirmed the ambiguity of three scales: "Open/Closed," "I feel O.K./I feel not O.K.," and "Encouraged me to express ideas/Discouraged me from expressing ideas." These scales were deleted from subsequent analyses.

Jury panel analysis. Results of jury panel responses are presented in the order of items on the jury panel questionnaire (Figure 2). In response to the first item, jurors indicated that directions were clearly worded. The percent of jurors designating the clarity of each SEC item is shown in Table 2. Although all items met the minimum standard of 70% agreement, some judges rated some items unclear to them.

Table 2 also shows jury panel agreement on the dimension and factor location of SEC items. Judges agreed on the dimension location of 29 of 30 SEC items. Furthermore, their dimension classification agreed exactly with those of the student services committee and with the results of the principal components analysis. At least 70 percent of the jurors agreed on the factor placement of 15 of the final 25 SEC items; a surprising result considering that no definitions of factor names were given to the jurors. Table 2 also shows that juror placement of items on factors was more like the placement of the student services committee than like the placement by factor analysis.

However, the consistency between counseling theory, the structure hypothesized by the student services committee, the confirmation by the principal components analysis and the jury panel comprise evidence of the construct validity of the SEC.

Evidence of the content validity of the SEC was provided by the jury panel, also. Each SEC factor was rated either consistent or very consistent with counseling theory by at least 70% of the jury panel. In addition, 75% of the jury panel rated the SEC dimensions appropriate or very appropriate for evaluating counselor services. In their open-ended comments, jurors complimented the comprehensiveness of the SEC and rated it an appropriate way to assess counselor effectiveness.

Reliability of the SEC

Item reliability. Item reliability in relation to total and factor scores were calculated using point biserial correlations. As presented in Table 2, for every scale, the correlation between item and factor score was higher than the correlation between item and total score. Thus, the instrument is multidimensional.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Item-factor reliabilities ranged from a high of .87 to a low of .66. Using .70 as a minimum acceptable internal consistency coefficient (Tuckman, 1972), items 6, "honest/dishonest" and 8, "attentive/inattentive" were eliminated from further analyses.

Reliability of total, dimension and factor scores. Deletion of three ambiguous and two unreliable items reduced the number of SEC items from 30 to 25. Factor, dimension, and total scores, therefore, were calculated over 25 items.

To determine whether SEC scores were sufficiently free of chance errors to permit use of total, dimension and factor scores, internal consistency reliability coefficients were calculated using Cronbach's Alpha. As shown in Table 3, the total score had the highest reliability and the outcome dimension was slightly more reliable than the process dimension. All of the composite score reliabilities exceeded the .70 minimum acceptable level. The standard error of a total score was 5 points out of a maximum possible score of 245. These analyses confirm the reliability of the SEC for practical use.

Table 3

Alpha Reliability Coefficients for SEC Composite Scores

TOTAL SCORE	.92
DIMENSIONS--	
Process	.87
Outcomes	.90
FACTORS--	
Acceptance of Client	.85
Support of Client	.69
Counselor Self-Acceptance	.74
Worthwhileness	.90
Client Independence	.85

SUMMARY

Initial development of a semantic differential instrument for student evaluation of counseling conferences was described in this paper.

Based upon jury panel and principal components analysis, the SEC shows substantial content and construct validity. In addition, SEC total, dimension and factor scores have internal consistency reliability coefficients which are comparable to those reported for many commercially published standardized tests. The validity and reliability of SEC factor scores permits their diagnostic use in assessing the effectiveness of counselor performance on the process and outcomes dimensions.

Limitations in the initial development of the SEC include:

- Use of only 10 counselors in one institution as the sample evaluated
- Use of only 281 student evaluators
- Lack of norms or performance standards for interpretation of results

All of these limitations will be eliminated as further development occurs. Meanwhile, even in its initial stage, the SEC represents a positive contribution to the development of a comprehensive system for the evaluation of counselor effectiveness at Moraine Valley.

References

American Psychological Association, Division of Counseling Psychology, Committee on Definition. "Counseling Psychology as a Specialty." American Psychologist, Vol. 11, pp. 282-285, 1956.

Anderson, R. P. and Anderson, G. V. "Development of an Instrument for Measuring Rapport." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 41, pp. 18-24, September 1962.

Banks, G.; Berenson, B. G. and Carkhuff, R. R. "The Effects of Counselor Race and Training Upon the Counseling Process with Negro Clients in Initial Interviews." Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 13, pp. 441-446, 1966.

Bashook, P. G. and Foster, S. F. How Many Es Are There?--A Critical Analysis of Problems Concerning Determination of Evaluative Factors of Semantic Differential Scales. Paper presented at AERA Annual Meeting: New Orleans, Louisiana, 1973.

Blocker, D. H. "Wanted: A Science of Human Effectiveness." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 44, 1966.

Boy, A. V. and Pine, G. J. "Strengthening the Off-Campus Practicum." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 6, pp. 40-43, Fall 1966.

Brown, F. G. "Seven Years of the Journal: A Review." The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 48, pp. 270-272, 1969.

Brown, R. D. Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education--A Return to the Academy. American College Personnel Association: Washington, D.C., 1972.

Carkhuff, R. R. "Some Reflections on Helping and Human Resource Development Models." The Counseling Psychologist, Vol. 3, pp. 79-87, 1972.

Chickering, A. W. Education and Identity. Jossey-Bass, Inc.: San Francisco, California, 1969.

Combs, A. W. and Soper, D. W. "The Perceptual Organization of Effective Counselors." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 10, pp. 222-226, 1963.

Eckstein, D. G. Improving Counselor Effectiveness by Means of Feedback and Encouragement. A paper presented at the 82nd Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association: New Orleans, Louisiana, August 1974. (ED 098 467)

Hecht, A. R. A Semantic Differential Evaluation of Attitudinal Outcomes of Introductory Physical Science. Doctoral dissertation. University Microfilms: Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1970. (No. 71-5123)

Heise, D. R. "Some Methodological Issues in Semantic Differential Research." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 72, pp. 406-422, 1969.

Kane, R. B. "Semantic Differential Factor Structure with Concepts and Subjects from Education." Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 37, pp. 34-37, 1969.

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. Holt, Rinehart and Winston: New York, New York, 1965.

King, P. T. Research on Counselor Effectiveness. A paper presented to the 50th Annual Convention of the American College Personnel Association: Atlanta, Georgia, March 1975. (ED 110 883)

Kinnebrew, E. L. and Day, L. R. Staff Evaluation, Sacremento City College. Sacremento City College: Sacremento, California, 1973. (ED 088 543)

Linden, J. B.; Stone, S. C. and Shertzer, B. "Development and Evaluation of an Inventory for Rating Counseling." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 44, pp. 267-276, November 1965.

Martin, D. G. and Gazda, G. M. "A Method of Self-Evaluation for Counselor Education Utilizing the Measurement of Facilitative Condition." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 9, pp. 87-92, Winter 1970.

McKie, D. and Foster, S. F. "General Model for Multidimensional Analysis of Semantic Differential Attitude Data." Proceedings, 80th Annual Convention, A.P.A.: Honolulu, Hawaii, pp.45-46, 1972.

Milliken, R. L. and Paterson, J. J. "Relationship of Dogmatism and Prejudice to Counseling Effectiveness." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 6, pp. 125-129, 1967.

Norman, W. T. "Stability Characteristics of the Semantic Differential." American Journal of Psychology, Vol. 72, pp. 581-584, 1959.

Osgood, C. E. "Generality of Affective Meaning Systems." American Psychologist, Vol. 17, pp. 10-28, 1962.

Osgood, C. E.; Suci, G. J. and Tannenbaum, P. H. The Measurement of Meaning. University of Illinois Press: Urbana, Illinois, 1957.

Osgood, C. E.; Ware, E. and Morris, C. "Analysis of the Connotative Meaning of a Variety of Human Values as Expressed by American College Students." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 62, pp. 62-73, 1961.

Patterson, C. H. "Supervising Students in the Counseling Practicum." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 11, pp. 47-53, Spring 1964.

Patterson, C. H. Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy. Harper and Row, Publishers: New York, New York, 1966.

Percival, R. R. A Competency Measurement Instrument for Evaluating School Counselors. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, North Texas State University: Denton, Texas, May 1974. (Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 35, No. 7, p. 4165A.)

Perez, J. F. Counseling: Theory and Practice. Addison-Wesley: Reading, Massachusetts, 1965.

Peters, H. J. and Hansen, J. C. "Counseling Practicum: Bases for Supervision." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 2, Winter 1963.

Rogers, C. R. On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy. Houghton-Mifflin: Boston, Massachusetts, 1961a.

Rogers, C. R. "The Place of the Person in the New World of the Behavioral Sciences." The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 39, p. 449, 1961b.

Rowe, W.; Murphy, H. B. and DeCsipkes, R. A. "The Relationship of Counselor Characteristics and Counseling Effectiveness." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 45, pp. 231-246, Spring 1975.

Silverman, M. S. and Quinn, P. F. Objective Ratings of Monitor-Modeling Supervision in Practicum. Loyola University: Chicago, Illinois, 1972. (ED 071 005)

Smith, D. "Integrating Humanism and Behaviorism: Toward Performance." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 52, pp. 513-519, April 1974.

Snyder, W. U. and Snyder, B. J. The Psychotherapy Relationship. Macmillan and Co.: New York, New York, 1961.

Stefflre, B.; King, P. and Leafgren, F. "Characteristics of Counselors Judged Effective by Their Peers." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 9, pp. 335-340, 1962.

Thorsen, C. E. "Relevance and Research in Counseling." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 39, pp. 263-281, 1969.

Truax, C. B. "Effective Ingredients in Psychotherapy: An Approach to Unraveling the Patient-Therapist Interaction." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 10, pp. 256-263, 1963.

Truax, C. B. An Approach Toward Training for the Aide Therapist: Research and Implications. Address: Symposium on Non-Traditional Preparation for Helping Relationships. American Psychological Association Convention: Chicago, Illinois, September 5, 1965.

Truax, C. B. and Carkhuff, R. R. "The Old and the New: Theory and Research in Counseling and Psychotherapy." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 42, pp. 860-866, 1964.

Truax, C. B. and Carkhuff, R. R. An Introduction to Counseling and Psychotherapy: Training and Practice. Aldine: Chicago, Illinois, 1966.

Tuckman, B. W. Conducting Educational Research. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.: New York, New York, 1972.

Veldman, D. J. Fortran Programming for the Behavioral Sciences. Holt, Rinehart and Winston: New York, New York, 1967.

Warwick, D. P. and Lininger, C. A. The Sample Survey: Theory and Practice. McGraw Hill: New York, New York, 1975.

Whiteley, J. M.; Sprinthall, N. A.; Mosher, R. L. and Donaghy, R. T. "Selection and Evaluation of Counselor Effectiveness." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 14, pp. 226-234, 1967.

Wicas, E. A. and Mahan, T. W., Jr. "Characteristics of Counselors Rated Effective by Supervisors and Peers." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 6, pp. 50-56, 1966.

MORAINE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Figure 1

Student Evaluation of Counselors

Counselor's Name: _____

Part I. Counseling Process

Directions: For each pair of words or phrases, place an "X" at the point which represents your judgement of the counseling methods used by this counselor. For example, if you feel that your counselor was very supportive, mark your paper like this:

	Very	Quite	Slightly	Doesn't Apply	Slightly	Quite	Very	
supportive	X	o	.	:	.	o	o	unsupportive

During the counseling session, my counselor was:

	Very	Quite	Slightly	Doesn't Apply	Slightly	Quite	Very	
confusing	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	communicating
indifferent	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	interested
comfortable	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	uncomfortable
non-receptive	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	receptive
accepting	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	rejecting
dishonest	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	honest
tuned out	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	tuned in
attentive	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	inattentive
tense	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	relaxed
personal	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	impersonal
closed	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	open
sensitive	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	insensitive

During the counseling session, my counselor:

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Doesn't Apply	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree	
discouraged me from expressing ideas	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	encouraged me to express ideas
offered alternatives	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	dictated the solutions
encouraged independence	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	encouraged dependence
avoided my feelings	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	helped me to express my feelings
encouraged me to deal with my problem	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	avoided my problem

Part II. Counseling Outcomes

Directions: For each pair of words or phrases, place an "X" at the point which represents your feelings about the results of your counseling sessions with this counselor.

My sessions with the counselor were:

	Very	Quite	Slightly	Doesn't Apply	Slightly	Quite	Very	
meaningless	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	meaningful
worthless	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	worthwhile
helpful	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	harmful
unsatisfactory	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	satisfactory

As a result of my counseling session:

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Doesn't Apply	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree	
decisions were made for me	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	I am learning to make my own decisions
I have a more positive attitude about myself	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	I have a more negative attitude about myself
I was helped to see my problem	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	I was not helped to see my problem
I feel shut off	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	I feel I can return to my counselor
I learned new ways of behaving	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	I did not learn new ways of behaving
I was encouraged to think for myself	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	I received a great deal of advice
I feel not O.K.	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	I feel O.K.
I would refer other students to this counselor	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	I would not refer other students to this counselor
I have less confidence in my abilities and decisions	o	o	.	:	.	o	o	I have more confidence in my abilities and decisions

Part III. Counseling Services

Directions: Please place an "X" at the point which represents your judgement of the counseling services provided by this counselor.

This counselor provided service by:

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Doesn't Apply	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
giving accurate information on MVCC courses	o	o	.	:	.	o	o
giving accurate information on MVCC certificate and degree requirements	o	o	.	:	.	o	o
giving accurate transfer information	o	o	.	:	.	o	o
giving adequate assistance with my career planning	o	o	.	:	.	o	o
adequately assisting me with my personal concerns	o	o	.	:	.	o	o
directing me to appropriate audio-visual and printed information	o	o	.	:	.	o	o
referring me to an appropriate staff person who could help me	o	o	.	:	.	o	o

Part IV. Summary Comments

Directions: Please answer in the spaces below. You may want to describe an incident to illustrate your comments. Use other side of paper, if necessary.

1. What contributes most to this counselor's effectiveness?

2. In what ways could this counselor increase his/her effectiveness?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION

Figure 2

QUESTIONNAIRE
COUNSELOR EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

PART I. Student Evaluation of Counselors Instrument

The Student Evaluation of Counselors instrument is to be completed by students who have seen a counselor for individual counseling. Please indicate your response to the following items regarding this instrument.

Underline any directions on the instrument which are not clearly worded.

Please circle the numbers of the items on the Student Evaluation of Counselors instrument which are not clear in their meaning.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37

The items for the Student Evaluation of Counselors instrument were divided into two dimensions: Process and Outcomes. These dimensions were divided into five scales: Counselor Acceptance of Counselee, Counselor Support of Counselee, Counselor O.K.ness, Worthwhileness and Counselee Independence. The names of the dimensions and scales are listed below. Please write the numbers of the items (1-30) which in your judgement fit each dimension and scale.

DIMENSION--Counseling Process

_____

DIMENSION--Counseling Outcomes

_____

SCALE--Acceptance of Counselee

_____

SCALE--Counselor Support

_____

SCALE--Counselor O.K.ness

_____

SCALE--Worthwhileness

_____

SCALE--Counselee Independence

_____

What additional scales should be considered for use on the instrument?

_____

_____

What additional items should be considered for use on the instrument?

_____

_____

Please indicate the degree to which the scales are or are not consistent with your perception of counseling theory. The key is as follows:

Very Consistent	Consistent	Neutral	Inconsistent	Very Inconsistent
0	o	.	o	0
		Acceptance of Counselee		
0	o	.	o	0
		Counselor Support		
0	o	.	o	0
		Counselor O.K.ness		
0	o	.	o	0
		Worthwhileness		
0	o	.	o	0
		Counselee Independence		
0	o	.	o	0

The model for this instrument is that counseling process, counseling outcomes and counseling services be evaluated. Please indicate the degree of appropriateness in evaluating counseling services on this instrument

Very Appropriate	Appropriate	Neutral	Inappropriate	Very Inappropriate
0	o	.	o	0

Please make any comments which would support your judgement.

_____

_____

_____

Part II. Additional Comments

Please make any additional comments regarding the construction, use or appropriateness of this instrument.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

Table 1

Rotated Factor Loadings of Student Evaluation of Counseling--Outcomes Dimension

Scale	Factor	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	Communality
	I. Conference Worthwhileness						
18	Meaningful/Meaningless	819	257	230	54	-227	844
19	Worthwhile/Worthless	815	230	266	16	-236	844
20	Helpful/Harmful	757	191	282	166	- 19	717
21	Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory	738	251	297	205	-104	749
29	I would refer other students to this counselor/ I would not refer other students to this counselor	612	266	37	292	- 93	540
25	I feel I can return to my counselor/ I feel shut off	542	440	308	200	0	621
	II. Client Independence						
26	I learned new ways of behaving/ I did not learn new ways of behaving	185	729	162	108	- 85	611
23	I have a more positive attitude about myself/ I have a more negative attitude about myself	353	714	113	33	-102	659
22	I am learning to make my own decisions/ Decisions were made for me	178	707	- 10	116	-298	633
30	I have more confidence in my abilities and decisions/ I have less confidence in my abilities and decisions	351	702	141	103	109	658
24	I was helped to see my problem/ I was not helped to see my problem	300	662	208	7	-154	595
27	I was encouraged to think for myself/ I received a great deal of advice	- 33	699	14	135	-266	579
	PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIANCE	14	14	15	10	7	

Leading decimal points have been omitted.

Table 1 (Continued)

Rotated Factor Loadings of Student Evaluation of Counseling--Process Dimension

Scale	Factor	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	Communality
	III. Acceptance of Client						
2	Interested/Indifferent	191	98	773	215	-115	703
7	Tuned in/Tuned out	106	173	714	221	-135	618
1	Communicating/Confusing	271	88	689	238	-102	623
4	Receptive/Non-Receptive	142	23	684	210	26	534
9	Relaxed/Tense	244	152	640	90	- 88	508
13	Encouraged me to express ideas/ Discouraged me from expressing ideas	75	173	561	209	-435	583
6	Honest/Dishonest	183	72	501	386	- 21	439
8	Attentive/Inattentive	278	49	460	347	-174	442
	IV. Counselor Self-Acceptance						
10	Personal/Impersonal	78	100	191	694	- 70	539
12	Sensitive/Insensitive	20	167	174	674	-304	605
5	Accepting/Rejecting	144	128	305	674	164	611
3	Comfortable/Uncomfortable	188	39	247	587	- 59	445
	V. Counselor Support						
15	Encouraged independence/Encouraged dependence	41	204	77	194	-675	542
14	Offered alternatives/Dictated the solutions	183	85	171	247	-644	546
	PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIANCE	14	14	15	10	7	

Leading decimal points have been omitted.

Table 2

SEC Item Validation by Jury Panel, Student Services Committee and Principal Components Analysis

Scale	Percent of Jurors Agreeing on Item Clarity	Jury Panel		Student Services Committee		Factor Analysis	
		Dimension	Factor	Dimension	Factor	Dimension	Factor
1	75	P	-	P	6	P	3
2	92	P	3	P	3	P	3
3	92	P	-	P	4	P	4
4	75	P	3	P	6	P	3
5	92	P	3	P	3	P	4
* 6	92	P	4	P	4	P	3
7	75	P	3	P	6	P	3
* 8	92	P	-	P	3	P	3
9	92	P	4	P	4	P	3
10	92	P	3	P	3	P	4
*11	75	P	-	P	4	P	-
12	92	P	-	P	6	P	4
13	100	P	-	P	5	P	3
14	92	P	-	P	5	P	5
15	100	-	2	P	5	P	5
16	92	P	-	P	5	P	5
17	100	P	5	P	5	P	5
18	92	O	1	O	1	O	1
19	92	O	1	O	1	O	1
20	92	O	1	O	1	O	1
21	92	O	1	O	1	O	1
22	100	O	2	O	7	O	2
23	92	O	1	O	8	O	2
*24	100	O	-	O	7	O	-
25	83	O	-	O	1	O	1
26	100	O	-	O	7	O	2
27	75	O	2	O	8	O	2
*28	75	O	-	O	8	O	-
29	100	O	-	O	1	O	1
30	100	O	-	O	8	O	2

Key:
* = Item deleted from instrument
P = Processes
O = Outcomes
- = Disagreement

1 = Conference Worthwhileness
2 = Client Independence
3 = Counselor Acceptance of Client
4 = Counselor Self-Acceptance
5 = Counselor Support
6 = Counselor Responses to Client
7 = Client Decision-Making Ability
8 = Client Self-Acceptance

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 30 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

Table 3

Poist-Biserial Correlations
Between SEC Items and Total and Factor Scores

SEC Number	Factor	R(Total)	R(Factor)
1	3	.6145	.7802
2	3	.6159	.8253
3	4	.4753	.6977
4	3	.4769	.7441
5	4	.5776	.7458
6	3	.5013	.6557
7	3	.5961	.7913
8	3	.5441	.6600
9	3	.5589	.6907
10	4	.4694	.7766
12	4	.5382	.7863
14	5	.5118	.6897
15	5	.4630	.7472
16	5	.6592	.7304
17	5	.6415	.7224
18	1	.7344	.8744
19	1	.7243	.8664
20	1	.6698	.8240
21	1	.7438	.8628
22	2	.6207	.7730
23	2	.6742	.7951
24	2	.6673	.7656
25	1	.7141	.7875
26	2	.6449	.7827
27	2	.5378	.7532
29	1	.6111	.7550
30	2	.6301	.7359